

## Remarks

It is respectfully requested that claims 25 - 47 be reconsidered for allowance in view of this Amendment and these Remarks.

The Examiner noted that applicant's argument was not commensurate with the scope of the claims, and the Examiner suggested specific claim language to eliminate this problem. Applicant gratefully acknowledges and appreciates the Examiner's suggestion.

Accordingly, claim 25 has been amended to more accurately define the present invention. Amended claim 25, as suggested by the Examiner, now recites "... the internal combustion engine is drivingly connected to the rear wheels through only purely mechanical components ...". Claim 25 is further amended to recite "... all the drive components between the internal combustion engine and the rear wheels are purely mechanical ...". This is supported by the original specification and drawings which show that all the drive connection components between the engine 16 and rear wheels 14 are purely mechanical, including mechanical drive 18 and axles 12. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 25 - 32, 36-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Higasa et al. ('806) in view of Kawamura. However, this rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the amendment made to claim 25 herein. Amended claim 25 now recites "...the internal combustion engine is drivingly connected to the rear wheels through only purely mechanical components ...", as suggested by the Examiner. Claim 25 also now recites "... all the drive components between the internal combustion engine and the rear wheels are purely mechanical ...". Thus, a distinguishing feature of the invention is a vehicle with front wheels driven by electric drives, and with rear wheels driven by only purely mechanical components, and that all the drive components between the internal combustion engine and the rear wheels are purely mechanical.

In contrast, in both Higasa and Kawamura all the wheels are driven by electric motors. There are no wheels which are driven by only purely mechanical drive components, as recited in amended claim 25. Thus, a combination of both Higasa and Kawamura cannot teach or suggest wheels which are driven by only purely mechanical components, as recited in amended claim 25. Thus, amended claim 25 should be allowed and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 26 - 47 should be allowed because they now depend directly or

indirectly from allowable amended claim 25.

In conclusion, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Any fees or charges due as a result of filing of the present paper may be charged against Deposit Account 04-0525.

Respectfully,

/Joel S. Carter, Reg. # 29,368/

Joel S. Carter

Attorney for Applicant

Joel S. Carter  
Deere & Company  
Patent Department  
One John Deere Place  
Moline, IL 61265  
(309) 765-4045